

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-30 remain in this application. Claim 22 was previously amended. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 4, 9, 11-16, 24, and 29. It should be noted that Applicant has elected to amend said Claims solely for the purpose of expediting the patent application process in a manner consistent with the PTO's Patent Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (9/8/00). In making this amendment, Applicant has not and does not in any way narrow the scope of protection to which Applicant considers the invention herein to be entitled and does not concede, in any way, that the subject matter of such Claims was in fact taught or disclosed by the cited prior art. Rather, Applicant reserves Applicant's right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-2, 4-17, 19-25 and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beranek et al. (6,226,642) in view of Kavner (6,366,947). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 11-16 and 29-30:

Claims 1, 11-16, and 29 have been amended to clarify the invention. Claim 1 appears as follows:

1. A method of optimizing retrieval of electronic documents, comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

receiving and routing network packets;  
extracting a first electronic document from the network packets;  
identifying one or more symbolic references to other electronic documents within the first electronic document;  
determining a network address of each of the other electronic documents corresponding to each of the symbolic references;  
creating and storing a modified copy of the first electronic document in which the network address is substituted for each corresponding symbolic reference in accordance with one or more substitution policies;  
delivering the modified copy of the electronic document in response to all subsequent client requests for the first electronic document.

In particular, Beranek and Kavner do not teach or disclose a system that receives and routes network packets and extracts a first electronic document from the network packets as claimed in Claim 1. Neither Beranek nor Kavner mention such a system and therefore do not contemplate such a system.

Additionally, Beranek does not teach or disclose a system that creates and stores a modified copy of the first electronic document in which the network address is substituted for each corresponding symbolic reference in accordance with one or more substitution policies as claimed in Claim 1. As noted in the Office Action, Beranek does not explicitly teach identifying one or more symbolic references to other electronic documents within the first electronic document, determining a network address of each of the other electronic documents corresponding to each of the symbolic references. Beranek further does not disclose creating and storing a modified copy of the first electronic document in which the network address is substituted for each corresponding

symbolic reference in accordance with one or more substitution policies. Beranek and Kavner do not contemplate substituting network addresses for each corresponding symbolic reference in accordance with one or more substitution policies.

Therefore, Beranek in view of Kavner does not teach or disclose the invention as claimed.

Claim 1 is allowable. Independent Claims 11-16 and 29 are similarly allowable. Claims 2, 4-10, and 28 are dependent upon Claim 1 and are allowable. Claims 19-25 and 27 are dependent upon Claim 16 and are allowable. Claim 30 is dependent upon Claim 29 and is allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

### III. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected Claims 3, 18 and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beranek et al. (6,226,642) in view of Kavner (6,366,947), as applied to claims 1 and 16 above, and further in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA).

The rejection under 35 USC §103(a) is deemed moot in view of Applicant's comments regarding Claims 1, 11-16 and 29, above. Claims 3 and 26 are dependent upon Independent Claim 1. Claims 18 and 27 are dependent upon Independent Claim 16. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 USC §103(a).

IV. MISCELLANEOUS

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

The Applicants believe that all issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed and that allowance of the pending claims is appropriate. Entry of the amendments herein and further examination on the merits are respectfully requested.


The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (408) 414-1214 to discuss any issue that may advance prosecution.

No fee is believed to be due specifically in connection with this Reply. To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee that may be due in connection with this Reply to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: July 1, 2005

  
Kirk D. Wong  
Reg. No. 43,284

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, California 95110-1089  
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 214  
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

on July 1, 2005  
(Date)

by

  
(Signature)